

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-22 are pending in the application, with 1, 7, 13, 17, and 20 being the independent claims. Claims 4, 10, and 16 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1, 7, 13, 17, and 20-22 are amended to clarify the invention. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on September 8, 2006. During the interview, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner generally discussed the invention and the Office Action. In particular, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed U.S. Patent No. 6,834,079 to Strait *et al.* (herein Strait) and claim one of the present application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page two of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Strait. On page three of the Office Action, dependent claim 4 is allegedly anticipated by the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Strait nor the "Background of the Invention" section describes each and every element as set forth in amended independent

claims 1, 7, and 17. Specifically, Applicant's claims 1 and 17 as amended recite "wherein the target impulse response is represented by a data set having $M+1$ data elements, wherein at least a first or a last of the $M+1$ data elements is set to zero."

Applicant's claim 7 as amended recites "wherein the target impulse response is represented by a data set having $M+1$ data elements; and setting at least a first or a last of the $M+1$ data elements to zero."

Neither Strait nor the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification address "setting at least a first or a last of the $M+1$ data elements to zero" or "at least a first or a last of the $M+1$ data elements is set to zero." Thus, neither Strait nor the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification describe each and every element as set forth in amended independent claims 1, 7, and 17. If the rejection is maintained using the cited references mentioned above, Applicant requests that each of the distinctions recited above be addressed with specificity.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Strait and the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification do not teach each and every feature of Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, and 17 and therefore do not anticipate these claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended claims 1, 7, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be removed, and that independent claims 1, 7, and 17 and their respective dependent claims 3-6 and 19 be passed to allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page four of the Office Action, claims 7, 9-13, 15-16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strait in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,552 to Pessoa (herein "Pessoa"). Further, on page five of the Office Action,

dependent claims 10 and 16 are allegedly anticipated by the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and respectfully requests this rejection be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

Applicant's amended claims 7, 13, and 20 recite in part: "wherein the target impulse response is represented by a data set having M+1 data elements; and setting at least a first or a last of the M+1 data elements to zero."

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Strait, Pessoa, nor the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification, alone or in combination, teach, suggest, or disclose "wherein the target impulse response is represented by a data set having M+1 data elements; and setting at least a first or a last of the M+1 data elements to zero" as recited in independent claims 7, 13, and 20. Specifically, Strait does not disclose "wherein the target impulse response is represented by a data set having M+1 data elements; and setting at least a first or a last of the M+1 data elements to zero" as recited in independent claims 7, 13, and 20. Neither Pessoa, nor the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification overcome this deficiency of Strait. Further, Pessoa and the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification do not teach, suggest, or disclose "setting at least a first or a last of the M+1 data elements to zero," as recited in Applicant's amended claims 7, 13, and 20.

Therefore, because neither Strait, Pessoa, nor the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification, alone or in combination, teach, suggest, or disclose all of the recited claim limitations of independent claims 7, 13, and 20 for at least the reasons herein, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be removed and that these claims and their respective dependent claims 9-12 and 15-16 be passed to allowance.

On page five of the Office Action, claims 2, 8, 14, 18, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strait in view of Pessoa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,386 to Spruyt (herein "Spruyt"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and respectfully requests this rejection be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2, 8, 14, 18, and 21-22 depend upon their respective independent claims 1, 7, 13, 17, and 20. Spruyt does not cure the deficiencies mentioned above for Strait in view of Pessoa, and further in view of the "Background of the Invention" section of Applicant's specification. Accordingly, claims 2, 8, 14, 18, and 21-22 are allowable for at least being dependent from an allowable independent claim, in addition to their own respective features. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

Date: _____

10/16/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

570791_2.DOC